

caste - men ; but, as might be expected from the geographical position of this tract, this pollution carries further than in the rest of the Madras Presidency. In Cochin it appears that a Parayan may not approach within half a furlong of a caste-man. British administration, with its strong tendency to extend justice to all alike, has to a large extent broken down these deep-rooted prejudices, and even Brahmans have to submit to the presence of Parayans within a few yards of their persons in our courts and offices.

The author's account of the manners and customs of the fishing castes and their devices for catching fish is very interesting, and the illustrations are excellent.

Mr. Anantha Krishna Iyer's next volume will be welcomed, not only by ethnologists, but also by the general public; for apart from the scientific results obtainable from the present one it contains much that without exaggeration may be classed as good reading.

R. SEWELL.

DER RIGVEDA IM AUSWAHL. (ERSTER TEIL, GLOSSAR ; ZWEITER TEIL, KOMMENTAR.) By KARL F. GELDNER. Stuttgart, 1907 and 1909.

It need hardly be said that anything from Professor Geldner's pen dealing with the *Rgveda* is of the highest value to Vedic studies, and the selection of hymns which he has chosen for study includes many of the most interesting and important of the hymns of the *Samhitā*, while the glossary not merely covers the uses of the words noted which occur in the hymns included in the selection, but in many cases extends to the whole of the *Rgveda*, and includes notices of other texts, such as the *Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā*.

It must, however, be regretted that imperative considerations of space have prevented the discussion of the

views of other scholars on the hymns of which Professor Geldner treats. The *Rgveda* is on the whole a most difficult and obscure work, and progress to its adequate interpretation must needs in large measure be through careful enumeration and criticism of opposing views, just as the elucidation of classical works has been effected through constant critical work. Of course Professor Geldner in arriving at his own results has tested the renderings of others, and we must regard what he gives us as his deliberate opinion of what is the true sense of the passage. But no reasons are given for his decisions, and we miss the statement of grounds which might enable us to dismiss for good as impossible a variant interpretation. Moreover, though no doubt students of the selection may be expected to have the *Vedische Studien* available, some needless trouble might have been saved by brief references, both in the glossary and the commentary, to the relevant passages in the *Vedische Studien*.

A good example of the disadvantages of this method is seen in Professor Geldner's comment on *Rgveda*, x, 33. 34. He accepts the version of the *Anukramaṇī* that these hymns are by Kavaṣa, and he ingeniously shows that the reference in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*¹ to Kavaṣa as a *kitava*, "gambler," is supported by the dicing hymn, x, 34, where Kavaṣa, in his opinion, bemoans his fate. But he rejects the view of the *Anukramaṇī* that in x, 33, Kavaṣa consoles the prince Upamaśravas for the death of Mitrāthithi, his grandfather, and instead explains the hymn as a lament of Kavaṣa because he had fallen into disgrace with his master Upamaśravas, and had been cast like Trita² into a pit by him, and he considers that the true story had early been forgotten. Now what ground is there to accept the mention of Kavaṣa as author of the hymns as correct? It is not early: on the contrary, as

¹ ii, 19. This point is not found in the Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, xii, 3.

² Compare x, 33, 2. 3, with i, 105, 8.

the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* does not recognize him as author of x, 34, it may safely be said that the attribution is late and improbable. Nor is the evidence better for the authorship of x, 33. It is true that a Kavaṣa appears in the battle of the ten kings,¹ but it is not certain that he was a priest: he may have been a king, as Hopkins² thinks, and the most that can be said for any connexion between a Kavaṣa and Kuruśravaṇa is that the latter was a descendant of Trasadasyu, who was a Pūru king,³ and the Pūrus were on the same side as Kavaṣa in the battle of the ten kings, which, however, must be regarded as long anterior to the date of Kuruśravaṇa. It seems clear that we must give up the name Kavaṣa as that of the author, and it is also clear that the new Itihāsa invented by Professor Geldner has no sure foundation. The hymn seems certainly elegiac in tone, but instead of being inconsistent with the account of it given in the *Anukramaṇī* that fact is surely a confirmation of the notice. It seems from the first part of the hymn that the death of Kuruśravaṇa took place in circumstances of disaster, and in consoling Upamaśravas the poet may well have had little on which he could dwell with satisfaction. Nor is there any reference to a pit in which the singer was cast; it is true that the Nirukta⁴ treats the word *parśavaḥ* in RV. i, 105, 8 as meaning the sides of a hollow, but the sense is not probable nor necessary, nor does Geldner⁵ himself accept it. The poet is sorely afflicted, but the death of his master and the defeat of his people are adequate to account for all that is stated in the hymn.

¹ RV. vii, 18. 12.

² JAOS. xv, 260 seq. Mr. Pargiter (JRAS. 1910, p. 50) takes Kavaṣa as a Ṛṣi, and identifies him with the father of Tura, who consecrated, according to one version, Janamejaya. The conjecture is not a probable one, if only on chronological grounds, and in thinking (p. 49) that the Bharatas were enemies of Sudās Mr. Pargiter is following an improbable and now practically antiquated view of the relationship of Sudās and the Bharatas.

³ RV. iv, 38, 1 seq.

⁴ iv, 6.

⁵ *Vedische Studien*, ii, 184, n. 3.

Professor Geldner suggests a new interpretation of the well-known crux, RV. x, 18, 14. He thinks that the verse is to be considered as the thought of the dead man : “ the gods shall place me on a day to come (i.e. on rebirth in a mother’s womb) like the feather of the arrow in the shaft.” The idea is ingenious, but I do not think that it can be said to be more than that, and it is open to the objection that it assumes that the idea of rebirth is to be found in the *Rgveda*.¹ This is extremely doubtful, though, if we consider that the verse is a later addition, as is in all probability the case, this objection is not fatal, but the version has the capital defect of being less convincing even than the ordinary interpretation.²

Very clever is Professor Geldner’s attempt to make sense of RV. iii, 31. Following the confused notice of Yāska,³ he thinks that the beginning of the hymn contains a double metaphor from Indian family law. The father who makes his daughter a Putrikā, i.e. one whose son is appointed to perform the obsequies of his maternal grandfather,⁴ profits by the arrangement, but the son-in-law loses ; or again, if the father has a son, the daughter and her husband have no share in the inheritance ; similarly, the priest carries out all the toilsome part of the sacrificial ritual, but the patron alone profits by the offering, a broad hint for the latter not to forget the Dakṣiṇā for the priest. But unhappily the interpretation breaks down on the actual wording of the hymn, and it is probably best to admit—as does, in fact, Oldenberg⁵—that we have, as too often, a passage the sense of which will always remain doubtful. It is worth noticing that while Professor Geldner accepts here a line of

¹ As to this cf. my remarks, JRAS. 1909, p. 575, and see Oldenberg, *Rgveda-Noten*, i, 303.

² Cf. Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 386.

³ iii, 4. Cf. *Bṛhaddevatā*, iv, 110.

⁴ Cf. Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 72 ; *Die Adoption in Indien*, pp. 16, 17.

⁵ *Rgveda-Noten*, i, 239 seq.

interpretation based on Yāska, he deliberately rejects that authority's interpretation of RV. i, 124, 7, as also referring to the Putrikā. He may well be right in doing so, and in that case the Putrikā may be dismissed from the *Rgveda*. As a matter of fact the practice has a somewhat modern and artificial character, and it is at least noteworthy that it is not found mentioned in any certain passage in the literature before Yāska, the *Bṛhaddevatā* and the Dharma Sūtras.¹

Another addition, and not a very probable one, is made to the list of animals named in the *Rgveda* in the shape of the bull Daśadyu, called *śvaitreya* as the offspring of a *śvitrā* cow, which was used in battle and secured the victory.² It is idle to deny that the reference to Daśadyu is quite inadequate to determine who he was—he has been with some probability identified³ with Bhujyu because of the appearance of the word *tugriyāsu* in the passage and the fact that Bhujyu was the son of Tugra, and is called Tugrya—but the theory of a fighting bull is not made even probable by the quotation of a story of a fight between two bulls created by the gods and Asuras in the *Kāthaka Samhitā*,⁴ and the native tradition, for what it is worth, takes Śvaitreya as the metonymic of a man, not of a bull.

On the other hand, Professor Geldner is not apparently anxious to accept the view that the thirty-four lights referred to in the *Rgveda*⁵ are the five planets and the Nakṣatras, and he recognizes that the poetical description of the moon as *vidhūṃ dadrāṇaṃ samane bahūnām*

¹ e.g. *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*, xxviii, 20; *Vasiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra*, xvii, 17; and see Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 73.

² RV. i, 33, 14. 15.

³ Cf. Bergaigne, *Religion Védique*, iii, 11; Baunack, KZ. xxxv, 527; Ludwig, RV. v, 472.

⁴ xiii, 4. (Geldner's mode of citation by page and line is regrettably inadequate, though the citation by book and chapter is also unsatisfactory.)

⁵ x, 55.

has nothing to do with the path of the moon through the Nakṣatras, which are unknown to all save the latest parts of the *Rgveda*, such as the wedding hymn of Sūryā.

On the other hand, Professor Geldner desires to assimilate the ancient chariot to the modern cart of Bihar described by Dr. Grierson in his standard work on the customs of that province,¹ and he therefore identifies the somewhat mysterious *āṇi* of the *Rgveda*² with the wooden support of the frame of the chariot which was fastened to the axle outside the wheel. This is no doubt conceivable, but the evidence is strongly in favour of the *āṇi* being the lynch-pin or something similar.³ Nor is it probable that the technical expressions of politics, *udāsīna* and *pārṣṇigrāha*, applied in the *Mānava Dharma Śāstra*⁴ to denote a king who is a neutral between two hostile kings, really serve to explain *madhyamaśi* in the *Rgveda*, where the sense "arbitrator" seems at once plausible and adequate.

The selection, fortunately, includes some of the most interesting of the historical hymns of the *Rgveda*, and the series of Viśvāmitra and Vasiṣṭha hymns⁵ is satisfactorily explained, due recognition being given to Hopkins'⁶ clear proof that in RV. vii, 18 there is a deliberate allusion to Viśvāmitra by his successful rival. The only unsatisfactory part of the treatment of the hymns is the maintenance of the view that RV. iii, 53, 21. 24 contain a reference to Śakti's murder by the Viśvāmitras.⁷ It is also quite probable that Geldner's view of RV. vi, 27, which sees in Abhyāvartin Cāyamāna and Śrñjaya Daivavāta allies, not one prince, is preferable to the usual identification of both men which Zimmer⁸ urges, and it is satisfactory that Geldner adheres steadily to the view

¹ *Bihār Peasant Life*, § 167.

² Cf. my *Āitareya Aranyaka*, p. 237.

³ RV. iii, 33. 53; vii, 18, 33.

⁴ Cf. Oldenberg, *Rgveda-Noten*, i, 254.

⁵ RV. i, 35, 6.

⁶ vii, 158. 207.

⁷ JAOS. xv, 262.

⁸ *Altindisches Leben*, p. 133.

that neither Persian (*Parśu*)¹ nor Parthian (*Pārthava*)² is found in the *Saṃhitā*. Nor does he accept Hillebrandt's³ theory of the reference to the burning of the widow with her husband in the *Rgveda*⁴ as an interpolation from the ritual of the *Puruṣamedha*, or human sacrifice. As he well puts it, the widow shows, by approaching the dead body of her husband and lying beside it, that she is prepared to die with him, but she does not actually immolate herself; the Vedic age no longer practised the burning of widows, but the forms of the custom remained. And, again, he is probably right in accepting the hymn vii, 103 as a satire⁵ on a Brahmin school; probably the Vasiṣṭhas were making fun of the Viśvāmitras, for the verse vii, 103, 10^d does seem to repeat directly iii, 53, 7^d (*sahasrasāvē prā tiranta āyuh*), and he accepts in that hymn the meaning of *dvādaśa* as "the year", no doubt deliberately rejecting Jacobi's view that *dvādaśa* means the twelfth month.

In grammatical questions Professor Geldner shows the same boldness which he has evinced in the *Vedische Studien*. One general objection may be made, perhaps, to the principle which he adopts: it is no doubt true that grammatical irregularities are found in the *Rgveda*, but it is surely a matter of principle never to assume such irregularities when a reasonable sense can be made on the basis of the ordinary syntactical usages. For example, in RV. i, 50, 2, *āpa tyé tāyāvo yathā náksatrā yanti*, he says that *tye* is attracted to the gender of the object compared, and he compares RV. i, 191, 5 for the comparison. But though *náksatrā* is given in the *Padapāṭha*, and though Oldenberg⁶ is inclined to agree with the

¹ RV. x, 33, 2.

² RV. vi, 27, 8.

³ ZDMG. xl, 701.

⁴ x, 18, 8.

⁵ See Max Müller, *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 495, and cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 151.

⁶ *Rgveda-Noten*, i, 48.

Padapāṭha, it seems to me that Geldner was better advised in his *Glossar* in giving *nákṣatra* as both neuter and masculine. RV. vi, 67, 6 presents clearly a masculine *nákṣatra*, and when it is remembered that the Nakṣatras have some of them masculine names it is really not unnatural that *nákṣatra* should be found as a masculine, and the evidence for the neuter gender of *nákṣatra* is not Rgvedic.¹ Of course such an attraction is not impossible,² but to assume it because of the interpretation put on a form by the *Padapāṭha* is hardly desirable.

In some passages³ Professor Geldner sees the use of the participle as a finite verb; but in none of the cases cited can it possibly be said that the construction must necessarily be accepted, and unless some better examples can be adduced the construction must be considered to be doubtful. Professor Geldner himself does not accept the view in the case of *jaganvān* in *Rgveda*, x, 10, 1, and Professor Oldenberg,⁴ who is willing to accept the construction, does not quote any of the passages cited by Geldner in his list of examples of the usage. Or, again, is it really necessary to see a double relative in either RV. x, 52, 1 or iii, 32, 14? In the former passage we have *vísve devāḥ śāstāna mā yáthehá hótā vṛtō manávai yán niṣádyā*. But is the construction really *yáthā-yád* as Professor Geldner supposes? Surely it is rather *yáthā-manávai yán niṣádyā* (*manávai*). There are two quite distinct sentences, the second of which may either be taken as parallel to the first: "how being chosen as Hotṛ I shall be minded, what I shall think when I sit down," or as a temporal clause, "how I shall be minded, when sitting down I think"; in neither case any double relative really

¹ Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, ii, 268.

² Cf. *Āitareya Āraṇyaka*, v, 1, 1, with my note.

³ RV. i, 116, 2 (*śāsādānā*); ii, 38, 8 (*jārbhurāṇaḥ*); iv, 7, 10 (*dādṛśānam*); vii, 18, 12 (*vrñāñāḥ*). See Pāṇini, iii, 2, 106, and compare my remarks, ZDMG. lxiii, 346; JRS. 1910, 227.

⁴ *Rgveda-Noten*, i, 428.

occurring. In iii, 32, 14 the need to recognize a double relative is still less great, as Oldenberg's note amply shows. Similarly, while the singular verb with a "neuter plural" is a possible phenomenon,¹ it is surely needless to find it in RV. x, 10, 2: *salakṣmā yad viṣurūpā bhavāti*, where the obvious sense is given by the feminine. It is true that the *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā*² has *salakṣmā* and *viṣurūpam*, the *Padapāṭha* explaining *salakṣmā* as meant.³ But the correctness of the *Padapāṭha* is far from being beyond doubt, and the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*⁴ has *salakṣmānah* and *viṣurūpāh*, which conclusively supports the possibility of the feminine, for *salakṣmā* as a feminine is open to no substantial objection. Or, again, to assume, as Geldner does, attraction of the instrumental into the accusative in i, 147, 3 = iv, 4, 13, is hardly legitimate; the passage runs *yé pāyavo Māmateyām te agne pásyanto andhām duritād árakṣan | rarákṣa tām sukrto viśvávedā dīpsanta íd ripdvo náha debhuh ||* The sense is surely satisfactory that the guards themselves are guarded by the god; the instrumental rendering would weaken, not confirm, the force of the passage, and Oldenberg⁵ has abandoned his doubts⁶ as to the possibility of the rendering.

It would be easy to multiply indefinitely the points of

¹ See e.g. i, 81, 2; 162, 8, cited by Geldner; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.* iii, 230.

² vi, 20.

³ It is rather curious that Geldner should not simply take *salakṣmā* as a masculine form used for a neuter as he does, *Kommentar*, p. 72, n. 2, in the case of *rakṣohā*, vii, 8, 6; *amitrahā*, x, 170, 2; *ṛghāvā*, iv, 24, 8; and cf. *ojasvī*, *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, iv, 3, 8. But the examples are all dubious; the nominative of °han in the neuter is difficult to form (cf. Oldenberg, op. cit., i, 419; Lanman in Whitney's translation of the *Atharvaveda*, p. 968), and if *ojasvī* and *tejasvī* in the *Maitrāyaṇī* are not merely slips, due to *ojasvīni* and *tejasvīni* immediately preceding, there remains the obvious possibility of rendering them as nominatives, "the man who has the instruments (i.e. the *ratninaḥ*) becomes powerful as regards his kingdom," *tad* not matching *yasya* but being adverbial, which is perfectly legitimate.

⁴ i, 3, 10, 1 (the words are there in reverse order).

⁵ *Ṛgveda-Noten*, i, 147.

⁶ SBE. xlvi, 171.

interest raised by this valuable commentary, but it must suffice to note that Geldner offers a new but not very probable¹ version of the crux in iv, 24, 9, about Vāmadeva's sale of Indra; that he thinks that the order of the hymn containing the conversation of Agastya, the Maruts, and Indra is i, 170, 166, 171, and not as Sieg² takes them, and that he corrects tacitly but certainly rightly his former attribution to Sāyaṇa's brother of the remarks of Mādhava cited by Sāyaṇa on *R̥gveda*, x, 10; it is quite certain that the older Mādhava Bhaṭṭa is meant in that passage.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

THEODOR BENFEY. ZUM ANDENKEN FÜR SEINE KINDER
UND ENKEL. VON META BENFEY.

Benfey has, perhaps, hardly received the recognition in this country due to his great merits as a philologist and as a Sanskrit scholar. Philology, indeed, is not a study in which a scholar can hope to reap the full reward of his labours: its progress is so rapid, and it is so impossible to effect any work in it which can be said to be really permanent, that a philologist must expect to be superseded at an early date and to become little more than a name. It is not, then, wonderful that Benfey's Sanskrit Grammar, and his numerous lesser contributions to Vedic grammar, which were to have formed part of a complete Vedic Grammar, historic and comparative, should remain known mainly to scholars, but it is somewhat surprising that his great merits as a Vedic and Indian scholar should have been to some degree ignored. His edition of the *Sāmaveda* in 1848 was the first scientific edition of a Vedic Saṃhitā, and the work is still a model of editing. It was accompanied by much critical matter, by a translation, and

¹ Cf. Oldenberg, p. 419.

² *Die Sagenstoffe des R̥gveda*, pp. 108 seq.